

1 REMARKS

2 Status of the Claims

3 Claims 1-18 remain pending in the application, Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, and 16 having been
4 amended. Note that Claim 2 was edited to reflect an amendment in the Office Action Response to the
5 Office Action issued April 06, 2004, but was inadvertently not marked as "Currently Amended."
6 Thus, Claim 2 reflects the amendment previously presented, by not so indicated in the last response,
7 and accordingly, has been marked as "Currently Amended" in this Office Action response so that the
8 Examiner will be understand how the claim was amended.

9 Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

10 The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-18 as being anticipated by Microsoft Office 97, Copyright
11 1983-1996 by Microsoft Corporation. Selected screen captures of Microsoft Office 97 are presented in
12 Microsoft Office 97 – Send to Function, captured March 30, 2004 (hereinafter referred to as "the
13 Microsoft Office 97 reference"). The Examiner asserts that the Microsoft Office 97 reference describes
14 each element of applicants' claimed invention. However, as amended, it should be apparent that all
15 claims clearly distinguish over the cited reference, for the reasons discussed below.

16 In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this
17 response, the following discussion focuses on amended independent Claims 1, 10, and 16. The
18 patentability of each remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail.
19 However, applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent
20 claim should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's
21 conclusion that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references.
22 Similarly, applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim
23 element, or every comment made by the Examiner, should not be considered as an admission that
24 applicants concur with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding those claims. Indeed,
25 applicants believe that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited.
26 Moreover, a specific traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since
27 dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which
28 the dependent claims ultimately depend.

29 With respect to independent Claim 1, under the section of the present Office Action entitled
30 "Response to Arguments," the Examiner asserts that the features discussed by applicants in traversing

1 the previous rejection are not persuasive because they are not recited in the claims. Namely,
2 applicants pointed out that "a user can directly manipulate reminders present in the database, without
3 going through the application suite, thus it will be apparent that the user interface alternative is also
4 not another application program," "there is no teaching or suggestion of setting both the time and the
5 date in the cited reference," and "the reference neither teaches nor suggests applicant's seamless
6 method of creating a reminder to access a document from within either an application suite
7 comprising the application program or a user interface" are not recited in the rejected claims.
8 Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that unlike the Microsoft Office 97 reference,
9 applicants' claimed method is seamless and automated so that a user is not required to manually
10 access any other application program in order to create the timed reminder. The Examiner should
11 note that FIGURE 3 displays a reminder creation dialog 300, which provides support for this
12 amendment. Also, as previously mentioned by applicants, this dialog may be accessed from "*any of*
13 *the applications 240, 250, 260, 270 comprising the application suite 280,*" or "*from the user interface*
14 *200*" (see applicants' specification, page 13, lines 17-22).

15 In addition, Claim 1 provides the user is enabled to enter a time for displaying the reminder in
16 the dialogue that is displayed (see applicants' specification, page 16, lines 16-18). Thus, in applicants
17 claimed method, the user may selectively enter any desired time, instead of being forced to select a
18 predefined time. Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)
19 over the Microsoft Office 97 reference should be withdrawn for these reasons.

20 With respect to the previous traverse of the rejection of independent Claim 10, under the
21 section entitled "Response to Arguments," the Examiner indicates that applicants have argued
22 "Figure 4 does not show a database of messages" but then simply refers to the rejection of Claim 10
23 as noted in the preceding portion of the Office Action. Also, the Examiner directs applicants to
24 Figure 11, which the Examiner asserts discloses the database of messages, but acknowledges that it
25 does not contain any records.

26 However, it is not apparent to applicants how either Figure 4 or Figure 11 teaches or suggests
27 the step of automatically polling a database from a first application. The Examiner restates the same
28 argument for rejecting Claim 10 as he did in the Office Action from April 6, 2004, with the exception
29 that he now asserts the polling is automatic. But, just because Figure 4 shows an open e-mail
30 message being read and a reminder being created, it is not clear to applicants how FIGURE 4

1 inherently teaches automatic polling of a database from a first application. In addition, while
2 Figure 11 appears to be a reminder, there is no teaching or suggestion in the reference that any
3 database in a first application has automatically been polled.

4 Nevertheless, applicants have amended Claim 10 to include a step generally extracted from
5 Claim 11. Claim 10 as amended now recites that applicants' method *automatically* determines
6 whether an application capable of polling the database is active. The Microsoft Office 97 reference
7 neither teaches nor discloses this step, as the Examiner admits on page 5 of the Office Action where
8 the user, not software, determines if the application capable of polling the reminder data base is
9 active. Because, if Microsoft Outlook 97 is not active, *the user activates* it as shown in FIGURE 9.

10 In contrast, in applicants' method, the document reminder system will poll the database in order
11 to determine whether any application capable of polling need to be activated. The document reminder
12 system performs these steps during idle CPU cycles or as a background computing task. The polling is
13 typically carried out via at least one application within the application suite. Thus, an application
14 comprising a portion of the suite must be active in order to poll the database for the presence of any
15 imminent reminders. In the event that no portion of the application suite is active, the exemplary
16 embodiment may launch a background program for the sole purpose of checking the database at set
17 intervals (see applicants' specification, page 12, line 21 – page 13, lines 7). Since Microsoft Outlook
18 97 neither teaches nor discloses all the steps of applicants Claim 10, the rejection of independent
19 Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the Microsoft Office 97 reference should be withdrawn.

20 With respect to independent Claim 16, under the section of the Office Action entitled
21 "Response to Arguments," in regard to applicants' argument that the Microsoft Office 97 reference
22 neither teaches nor suggests automatically determining whether a checking application is active or
23 automatically activating a background checking program, Examiner simply directs applicants to the
24 rejection of claim 16 as set forth in a preceding portion of the Office Action and indicates that the
25 claim is rejected for the same reasons as Claims 1, 10, and 11. However, the reasons provided by the
26 Examiner for Claim 16 restate the same argument put forth in the Office Action response of April 6,
27 2004, but do not specifically explain why applicants' traversal of that rejection is not compelling.
28 Nevertheless, applicants have amended Claim 16 to clarify that it is automatically determined
29 whether or not a checking application is active without intervention by a user. In other words, a user
30 does not have to manually determine if the checking application is active. Furthermore, applicants

1 have also clarified that the background checking program is also automatically activated without
2 intervention by the user. Again, a user does not have to manually activate the background checking
3 program. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 16 should be withdrawn in view of the amendments
4 above, because Examiner admits on page 5 of the Office Action that the user, not software,
5 determines if an application capable of polling the reminder data base is active, and if Microsoft
6 Outlook 97 is not active, the user can activate it as shown in FIGURE 9. In contrast, applicants
7 method provides for an automatic determination that does not involve the user.

8 Because dependent claims are considered to include all of the elements of the independent
9 claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend and because the Microsoft Office 97
10 reference does not disclose or suggest all of what is recited in independent Claims 1, 10, and 16, the
11 rejection of dependent Claims 2-9, 11-15, and 17-18, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the Microsoft
12 Office 97 reference should be withdrawn. These dependent claims are patentable for at least the
13 same reasons noted above in the traverse of the rejection of Claims 1, 10, and 16.

14 In view of the amendments and Remarks set forth above, it will be apparent that the claims in
15 this application define a novel and non-obvious invention and are therefore patentable. Accordingly,
16 the application is in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue without further delay.
17 Should any questions remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number
18 listed below.

19 Respectfully submitted,

20 

21 Ronald M. Anderson
22 Registration No. 28,829

23 RMA/SKM:lrg

24 EXPRESS MAIL CERTIFICATE


25 "Express Mail" mailing label number: EV651959230US

Date of Deposit: April 25, 2005

26 I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post
27 Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. § 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for
28 Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

29 Kathy Paulino

30 (Typed or printed name of person mailing paper or fee)


(Signature of person mailing paper or fee)